



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of her war-fleet over all the waters of the earth, into the closest possible proximity to other countries. This policy, carried forward through a subtle, domineering and frequently conscienceless diplomacy, brings her into disrepute with all the better liberty-loving classes of Europe. It brings her into rivalry and conflict with the powers having similar policies and ambitions. In this way she arouses the indignation of the good, and the jealousy and hatred of the evil-minded. So long as she continues in this course, she will continue to reap its consequences — in an accumulating harvest.

In the attempt to uphold this policy, to clothe it in the garb of righteousness, to artfully entice the British people to accept all its ultimate demands, to cover up its weaknesses and dangers, to throw upon others the blame of its coming evil results, this last speech of Salisbury's has gone farther than any previous British imperialistic utterance. The whole blind, selfish, deceptive, ruinous spirit of imperialism and militarism is in every passage of it. And the pity of it is that it was uttered at the very moment when England's ears were most inclined to hear.

### Mission of the Boer Envoys.

So far as the mission of the Boer envoys to this country is purely in the interests of peace, to bring the moral power of American public opinion to bear upon Great Britain to induce her to stop the war and to respect the national rights of the two republics, it has our utmost sympathy. The injustice of England's conduct in pursuing such a course as to bring on the war, and in proposing to extinguish the independence of the republics, has had no severer condemnation than in these columns. We used our best efforts, small though they were, to bring about mediation by this government. We still believe that the government, under the Hague Convention provisions, ought to have made a much more serious effort in this direction than it did. It ought, independently of any request from either of the parties, to have voluntarily proposed mediation to both of them, giving its reasons why as a friendly neutral it felt that hostilities ought to cease. The moral effect of such a course would have been much greater than the mere tender of good offices on request from one of the parties. If all the nations signatory of the Hague Convention could have been brought to offer mediation jointly, we do not believe the English government could have resisted this united appeal of the civilized world in behalf of peace.

But *intervention* in favor of the Boers against England is a very different thing. Intervention always involves resort to arms, in case request is not complied with. In this case, it would be absolutely certain to result in war. The Boer envoys think that the mere utterance by this country of the word, "Stop the war!" would bring England to halt.

Quite the contrary is our judgment. In the present state of British opinion and war preparation at home and in the colonies the utterance of such a word would unleash all the English dogs of war. There would be such a struggle to the death as few generations have ever seen. The border between us and Canada would be a line of blood and horror. The war ships of the two nations would go to the bottom of the ocean in deadly grapple. The great commerce of the world, so largely British and American, would be destroyed. Suffering and distress unparalleled would be witnessed.

No one can picture faintly what the awfulness of the struggle would be between two such powers. Great, therefore, as is the wound to civilization which the South African War has caused, and iniquitous as it has been, infinitely more iniquitous and destructive to civilization would be a war between these two countries. To try to stop the smaller iniquity by commission of the immensely greater one would be the very acme of madness.

The motives which induce our government to abstain from intervention may not be our motives, may not be the highest, may be in part honorable, in part selfish, cowardly and politically base. Of that we do not attempt to judge here. But that the government ought to abstain on the highest ethical and humanitarian grounds seems to us entirely clear. The method of overcoming evil with evil stands condemned on every page of history. It is not encouraging that such multitudes of men still insist vindictively on using it with all its material hazards and moral degradations.

There are plenty of risks of war between this country and England, without using the natural sympathy of the nation for the Boers to multiply them. It will take the constant and most earnest efforts of all the friends of righteousness and peace in both countries to keep them from some day coming to a deadly clash. The imperialistic sentiments and policies which they are now so deeply plunged into may for the moment make them "cronies," but the motives and methods of imperialism have nothing in them tending to create true friendship and concord. On the contrary, if these policies are not abandoned, Boer and Filipino will not be the last to suffer from them. Briton and American, in the pursuit of their expansive ambitions, will some day come to a point where they cannot both have their way, when one or the other will have to give back. Then will come the dire conflict. The only way in which it can be avoided, so far as we can see, is in the abandonment of the whole imperialist spirit, root and branch.

Here is the point at which the friends of righteousness and peace can work most effectively. They ought to do all in their power, by every possible moral means, to induce the cessation of wars now going on and the settlement of the questions involved

in accordance with humanity and justice. They ought not to allow sympathy to lead them to abandon their own principles and to defend one people by violent wrong toward another and toward the whole of humanity. They ought to throw their influence solidly against any proposed action whose inevitable end would be a wicked and disastrous war. But, deeper than all these, they ought to work for the eradication of all those selfish, ambitious, lustful, vindictive sentiments and motives out of which war is continually being recreated. While these exist and are tolerated, small peoples will never be safe against great ones. Boer and Filipino, if saved from the claws of the lion and the eagle now, would fall into them, or some other claws, again before long. While these sentiments and motives exist and have a dominating influence, there can never be peace and friendship between great peoples.

### Editorial Notes.

#### Delays in Arbitration.

The International Arbitration and Peace Association of London has requested and received a letter from Dr. Brüstlein, secretary of the Delagoa Railway Arbitration tribunal, explaining the eight years and more of delay in reaching a decision. It is made clear that the tribunal was not at fault, the only delay of which it was the cause being occasioned by the grave illness of two of its members for several months. The tribunal was constituted on August 3, 1891. On February 22, 1892, the rules of procedure were finally settled. The exchange of statements between the court and the parties lasted four years, because of the continual delays required by all the parties, British, American and Portuguese. The reception of documentary evidence from the parties was not closed till June 15, 1896. It then became necessary to send out a commission of expert engineers, whose report of two hundred and forty-three printed folio pages was submitted to the parties early in 1898. The parties presented to the court their observations on the report by June 6, 1898. The committee of experts made a reply to the criticisms of the parties, bringing the case up to January, 1900. The final statements of the parties were not deposited till April, 1900. Portugal was allowed to present a refutation. The process was, therefore, not declared closed till May 1 of last year. Between this date and the delivery of the award, the serious illness of the two arbitrators occurred. It will thus be seen that the severe criticisms of the British papers against the tribunal ought rather to have been directed against the governments, of which Great Britain herself was one. Dr. Brüstlein takes occasion in his letter to say that if a permanent tribunal had been in existence, these delays would probably have been measurably avoided. The International Arbitration

and Peace Association has done a great service in securing from the secretary of the tribunal these statements, and giving publicity to them in the columns of *Concord*, its organ. The British papers which growled at the tribunal, and at arbitration in general as a failure, are probably too full of war just now to correct any of the mischief which their groundless diatribes have caused. But arbitration has survived "greater ills than these, and God will probably give an end to these also."

#### Militarism and Morals.

*Scribner's Magazine* speaks as follows of the social degradation produced by militarism:

"The degradation of character due to militarism takes many forms. There is the vicious ethics of war carried into social and industrial life. The deceit and fraud, more common in militant countries than in pacific, are evils that women must endure with men. There are the callousness and cruelty of war, from which they suffer far more than men. There is, finally, the moral laxity of war. The full story of the sufferings of women from this cause cannot be written. The standing armies of Europe spread a poison that penetrates the remotest corner of the social fabric. No class escapes it. The "gallantry" of officers is notorious. Not less so are their mercenary marriages. Among the rank and file occur those illegitimate unions common to every garrison town. Among the toilers the same evil prevails. Militarism acts directly and indirectly to make men unwilling to assume the responsibilities of marriage. How serious this evil has become may be gathered from the report of Dr. Hirscherberg, of Berlin. In that city alone, in 1887, eight thousand victims of these *Arbeiter-Ehen*, as they are called, who had been deserted by their companions, appealed for public relief. In 1895 the number reached twelve thousand. But Berlin is not the only capital thronging with these unfortunates. They crowd the dark corners of the cities of all the militant countries of Europe."

#### Wealth and War.

If Ruskin were still living and in his prime, one can imagine how he would pour out the seven vials of his English wrath against the last exhibition of the war-making power of British capitalist jobbery. Here is what he wrote some years ago:

"It is one very awful form of the operation of wealth in Europe that it is entirely capitalists' wealth which supports unjust wars. For an unjust war, men's bodies and souls have both to be bought, and the best tools of war for them besides, which makes such war costly to the maximum; not to speak of the cost of base fear and angry suspicion between nations which have not grace nor honesty enough in all their multitudes to buy an hour's peace of mind with; as, at present, France and England, purchasing of each other ten millions sterling worth of consternation annually (a remarkably light crop, half thorns and half aspen leaves, sown, reaped and granaried by the science of the modern political economist, teaching covetousness instead of truth). And,